

Another problem that I will be soon meeting with the Department of Education about is an amendment that former Congressman Solomon and I passed on the student loans that said if you are convicted of a drug offense, you lose your loan for 1 year. If you are convicted a second time after you come back in, you lose it for 2 years, and a third time and you are out.

The Department of Education has put out a form that over 100,000, probably 150,000 students, did not even check.

We need to take aggressive action to make sure that those students who did not check that cannot get their loan if they do not check that box. Furthermore, we need a random sampling procedure to make sure that they are actually telling the truth, that the Department of Education partly in my opinion as a gutting process said this applied to everybody in all their years prior to going to college.

This was an accountability provision, not before you went to college. But once you take a student loan, we expect you to be clean, because you cannot be learning if you are on drugs. You cannot be exercising your responsibility if we give you a subsidized loan and then you are on drugs.

I also had an amendment that said if you test clean twice during that process of your first suspension, you can get your loan back. I believe education is critical. But if we are really committed in this country, forget about just talking about Mexico or Colombia or Panama or Peru or Bolivia, if we are committed in this country and we really care about our kids and we care about the violence in the streets and violence in the families, we need to take some serious steps in this Congress to put some accountability at the high school level, at the elementary school level, at the college level and at the adult level, and put some dollars as well as some restrictions behind it.

TRAGEDY IN MOUNT MORRIS TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I speak today about the devastating tragedy in Mount Morris Township, Michigan, at Buell Elementary School, where a 6-year-old girl was shot and killed by a 6-year-old schoolmate. My thoughts and prayers go out to the families and to the schools and to the communities in this very devastating period of their lives.

□ 1430

Gun violence is an invasive problem within our society, with children often becoming the victims, perpetuated, unfortunately, by children. Unfortu-

nately, the tragedy in Michigan is not the first. We have all too often witnessed horrific school violence throughout the Nation, tragic stories of children being killed in schools in West Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Littleton, Colorado; and now in Mount Morris township, Michigan.

We have been shown that Americans are devastated by the impact that gun violence has on our children. Nearly 12 children die each day from gunfire in America, approximately one every two hours. That is equivalent to a classroom of children every 2 days. Gun violence is an equal opportunity disaster. Of the nearly 80,000 children killed by gunfire since 1979, 61 percent were white and 36 percent were black.

The National School Boards Association estimates that more than 135 guns are brought into the U.S. schools each day. Ten percent of all public schools experienced one or more serious crimes such as murder, rape, suicide, physical attack with a weapon, or robbery during the 1996-1997 school year that were reported to law enforcement.

Within my district, Indianapolis, Indiana's Tenth Congressional District, guns were confiscated on the Indianapolis public school property in 14 separate incidents. In December in Indianapolis, a 7th grader shot an eighth grader while riding a bus home from school.

I am outraged and saddened by the school violence that invades our schools, our communities, and our homes. Schools should be a safe haven for children to learn and to thrive and grow, where violence is not a fear for our children.

The bill that I introduced, H.R. 515, the Child Handgun Injury Prevention Act, which is a bill to prevent children from injuring themselves with handguns, requires child safety devices on handguns, and establishes standards and testing procedures for those devices. It does not describe specifically what kind of safety device, but it does, indeed, ask for a safety device.

At present it has only 66 cosponsors, not nearly enough. I would encourage my colleagues to rise to the challenge, avoid the resistance from anti-gun control lobbying advocates, take a strong stance against violence in our schools, and stand up for our children.

Promoting strong child handgun prevention legislation is not only the right thing to do; indeed, it is the moral thing to do.

GUN SAFETY AND THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of the House today to offer my sympathies for those who are now in danger in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, held hostage, at least as of the last notice that we received, by someone holding innocent individuals hostage with a gun. Several of these individuals have been shot, and that area is in crisis.

Additionally, of course, yesterday I think America got either a wake-up call or one of the most shocking exposures to gun violence that we have had I would say in the last 20 years, even as we watched the little, small children run to safety in California with a crazed gunman at the Jewish Community Center, a hateful act with a gun.

But here we find in Michigan that it was not an adult, it was not a 15-year-old, it was not a teenager, an adolescent, but it was a 6-year-old little boy that shot a little girl in the neck with a gun that apparently he secured from his home, a home that, as news reports have indicated, was not the best and most supportive situation for a child.

Without commenting on the support system that that family needs and the crisis and the ultimate criminal procedures that will follow, or whether or not there will be indictments of those parents, and what will happen in this situation in Pittsburgh, the question has to come, what now, America? What will this Congress do? What have we delayed in doing?

I can tell the Members that as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of the conference committee set up last year, 1999, to deal with gun safety and juvenile justice, we have yet to have another meeting. The first meeting ended with disagreement and opening statements, but no action.

I would commend to my colleagues, for those who argue vigorously about the privileges of the Constitution in the second amendment, I would argue for them to understand the Constitution as a living document.

The Second Amendment was drafted and promoted at a time that this was an embryonic country. It was a beginning Nation. It was a Nation that feared to be taken over by those who had once been its colonizer, if you will. The Second Amendment related to a well-armed militia. I have no problem with people legally retaining their guns in their homes, but I do have a problem with criminals getting guns.

It is tragic that the House conference committee has not seen fit to meet and to deal with what America wants us to do: one, reasonable, safe gun safety laws; two, to close the loopholes so criminals do not get guns, so a little baby 6 years old does not have the opportunity, in a home that may not be the best, that may have a criminal element, to access a gun.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely tragic that we would have a situation where a

child accessed a gun. What can we say about that, other than that we have not done our job? We must do our job. We must pass safety legislation that deals with trigger locks, that deals with smart guns, and we must find a way to convene and do what America desires us to do.

How many more killings will we see? How many more of those who are either deranged, needing mental assistance? How many more persons will we have suffering and losing their lives because we have not done our job?

Mr. Speaker, I think that in this instance all we can do is pray, but I think that what we can do in the future is to meet, and to be assured that as we meet, we have this committee that will find itself in its heart and in its mind to pass real gun safety legislation so that a 6-year-old does not have access to guns.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks, let me say that I hope that the conference committee will find its way to meet. If it meets, I hope we will find our way to vote for real gun safety legislation.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION CALLING FOR THE UNITED STATES TO WITHDRAW FROM THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my introduction of and request cosponsors for a privileged resolution to withdraw the United States from the World Trade Organization.

Last week, the Wall Street Journal reported that the United States was dealt a defeat in a tax dispute with the European Union by an unelected board of international bureaucrats. It seems that, according to the WTO, \$2.2 billion of United States tax reductions for American businesses violates WTO's rules and must be eliminated by October 1 of this year.

Much could be said about the WTO's mistaken Orwellian notion that allowing citizens to retain the fruits of their own labor constitutes subsidies and corporate welfare. However, we need not even reach the substance of this particular dispute prior to asking, by what authority does the World Trade Organization assume jurisdiction over the United States Federal tax policy? That is the question.

At last reading, the Constitution required that all appropriation bills originate in the House, and specified that only Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes. Taxation without representation was a predominant reason for America's fight for independence during the American Revolution. Yet, now we face an unconstitutional delegation of taxing authority to an

unelected body of international bureaucrats.

Let me assure Members that this Nation does not need yet another bureaucratic hurdle to tax reduction. Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution reserves to Congress alone the authority for regulating foreign commerce. According to Article II, section 2, it reserves to the Senate the sole power to ratify agreements, namely, treaties, between the United States government and other governments.

We all saw the recent demonstrations at the World Trade Organization meetings in Seattle. Although many of those folks who were protesting were indeed rallying against what they see as evils of free trade and capitalist markets, the real problem when it comes to the World Trade Organization is not free trade. The World Trade Organization is the furthest thing from free trade.

Instead, it is an egregious attack upon our national sovereignty, and this is the reason why we must vigorously oppose it. No Nation can maintain its sovereignty if it surrenders its authority to an international collective. Since sovereignty is linked so closely to freedom, our very notion of American liberty is at stake in this issue.

Let us face it, free trade means trade without interference from governmental or quasi-governmental agencies. The World Trade Organization is a quasi-governmental agency, and hence, it is not accurate to describe it as a vehicle of free trade. Let us call a spade a spade: the World Trade Organization is nothing other than a vehicle for managed trade whereby the politically connected get the benefits of exercising their position as a preferred group; preferred, that is, by the Washington and international political and bureaucratic establishments.

As a representative of the people of the 14th District of Texas and a Member of the United States Congress sworn to uphold the Constitution of this country, it is not my business to tell other countries whether or not they should be in the World Trade Organization. They can toss their own sovereignty out the window if they choose. I cannot tell China or Britain or anybody else that they should or should not join the World Trade Organization. That is not my constitutional role.

I can, however, say that the United States of America ought to withdraw its membership and funding from the WTO immediately.

We need to better explain that the Founding Fathers believed that tariffs were meant to raise revenues, not to erect trade barriers. American colonists even before the war for independence understood the difference.

When our Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution, they placed the treaty-making authority with the Presi-

dent and the Senate, but the authority to regulate commerce with the House. The effects of this are obvious. The Founders left us with a system that made no room for agreements regarding international trade; hence, our Nation was to be governed not by protection, but rather, by market principles. Trade barriers were not to be erected, period.

A revenue tariff was to be a major contributor to the U.S. Treasury, but only to fund the limited and constitutionally authorized responsibilities of the Federal government. Thus, the tariff would be low.

The colonists and Founders clearly recognized that these are tariffs or taxes on American consumers, they are not truly taxes on foreign corporations. This realization was made obvious by the British government's regulation of trade with the colonies, but it is a realization that has apparently been lost by today's protectionists.

Simply, protectionists seem to fail even to realize that raising the tariff is a tax hike on the American people.

OIL PIPELINE SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, oil and gas pipeline accidents happen more often than we might think. Just within the past few weeks, two major pipeline spills have occurred.

On February 5, an oil pipeline spilled approximately 70,000 gallons of crude oil into a lake in the John Heinz Wildlife Refuge near Philadelphia. The refuge incorporates the largest freshwater tidal marsh in the State and is habitat to two endangered species.

On January 27, approximately 500,000 gallons of oil leaked from a pipeline near Winchester, Kentucky. Officials are unsure how much of the oil will make its way into the Kentucky River, the main drinking water source for Lexington and other towns.

Thankfully, neither of these spills were ignited, like the spill which occurred in my district last June. The accident in my district resulted in three deaths, millions of dollars in property damage. How many more spills do we need to have before we act to improve our system of pipeline safety?

Recently, I introduced H.R. 3558, the Safe Pipelines Act of 2000. My bipartisan bill, which has been cosponsored by the entire Washington State House delegation, will enact much needed reforms to our Federal pipeline regulations, and will give the States a role in pipeline regulation, which they currently lack.

□ 1445

Under my bill, pipelines will be required to be inspected both internally